



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,652	02/04/2005	Xuanming Shi	05501-PCT	5850
33804	7590	03/12/2009	EXAMINER	
LIN & ASSOCIATES INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, INC. P.O. BOX 2339 SARATOGA, CA 95070-0339			SCHWARTZ, DARREN B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2435		
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		03/12/2009		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jason.lin@linassociatesip.com
jasonlin@gmail.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/523,652	Applicant(s) SHI, XUANMING
	Examiner DARREN SCHWARTZ	Art Unit 2435

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 20 January 2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, the Examiner will address issues raised by applicant.

Applicant argues on page 9 of REMARKS, "There is neither any authentication of sign-on module (ICP) in accessing the smart card, nor any stored ICP authentication information in Ferchichi"

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., smart card) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

First, independent claims 1 and 10 are silent to a "smart card." While applicant's invention discloses the user-login-identification means, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be limited to only a smart card when considering a "user-login-identification means."

Secondly, only dependant claims 14, 15 and 16, recite at least an card-reader and SD card, neither of which are considered smart cards in the art.

Lastly, claims 17 and 18 recite at least a mouse and a music player, neither of which are considered smart cards in the art.

The fact that the Examiner may not have specifically responded to any particular arguments made by Applicant and Applicant's Representative, should not be construed as indicating Examiner's agreement therewith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 and 3-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. (WO 01/60013 A1), hereinafter referred to as Ferchichi, in view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Pat Pub 2001/0037469 A1), hereinafter referred to as Gupta, in further view of Kawasaki (U.S. Pat Pub 7010688 B1), hereinafter referred to as Kawasaki.

Re claim 1: A method for centralizing administration of user registration information across networks (Abstract: lines 1-3), characterized by:
including at least an Internet Content Provider (ICP) [single sign-on module] and a user-login-identification means [Fig 13, elt 17: smart-card] which can access an online terminal [mobile phone/laptop] (Abstract: lines 1-3; page 6, lines 4-10);
wherein the ICP adds an interface module in a login web page (page 6, lines 11-14; page 17, lines 5-7) and
the ICP also provides an administration/drive module monitoring access of the user-login-identification means to set up a connection and hang up the connection for the user-login-identification means in the login web page (page 6, lines 19-26);
user's login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means (page 6, lines 24-26; page 12, lines 15-16);
ICP access authentication information is stored in the user-login-identification means to verify whether the accessing ICP is authorized to access (page 6, lines 19-26);
if the accessing ICP passed the verification, its access is permitted, otherwise the access is not permitted (page 12, lines 4-14);
wherein the ICP is permitted to access the user-login-identification means only if the ICP is authenticated , when the user-login-identification means is activated (page 12, lines 15-27) (see also page 13, lines 3-12 and lines 16-26).
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ferchichi reference to utilize a combination of

authentication schemes (i.e. a combination of Auth1,...,Auth9), as shown in figure 13, element 17, for the purpose of providing a more secure single-sign-on system while using a security token.

Gupta teaches authenticating comprises, obtaining an authentication file [cookie] via the interface module, transmitting the authentication file to the administration/drive module (¶35), decrypting the authentication file by the administration/drive module, and accessing the user-login-identification means (¶74, ¶86).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Ferchichi with the teachings of Gupta, to securely transmit an authentication file for the verifying authority for the purposes of validating the client and verifying document parameters associated with the client. One would have also have been motivated to securely transmit the file for the purposes of preventing man-in-the-middle attacks.

However, Kawasaki explicitly teaches:

the ICP is authenticated to access the user-login-identification means via the interface module (Figs 5, elts 41, 42, "Match ?" → OBE verified & "Match ?" → ICP verified; col 3, lines 3-8) and

an identification (ID) number is provided to the user-login-identification means (col 7, lines 6-7; col 7, lines 28-43; col 8, lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Ferchichi and Gupta with the

teachings of Kawasaki, for the purpose of providing mutual authentication and uniquely identifying a user-login-identification means, as taught by Kawasaki.

Re claim 3: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the ICP accessing the user-login-identification means includes checking the user ID identification information stored in the user-login-identification means, or generating the user ID identification information in the user-login-identification means (Ferchichi: page 6, lines 24-27 and page 11, lines 19-22).

Re claim 4: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the ICP reads the information stored in the user-login-identification means, and if login identification information is obtained, the interface module returns the login identification information to the ICP web page and determines whether a login-submit or an automatic submit & login should be performed according to user's setup; if the login identification information is not obtained, the interface module informs the web page that the login identification information is not available and stores the generated login identification information in the user-login-identification means (Gupta: ¶73, ¶77).

Re claim 5: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches an ICP web page is provided with a registration information window (Gupta: ¶73); the ICP invokes parameters of the interface module and simultaneously saves several sets of registration information of a same web page or saves the last set of registration information in the user-login-identification means (Gupta: ¶74, lines 16-28; ¶78, lines 14-21), and the registration information can also be displayed on the ICP web page (Gupta: ¶36, lines 14-16)

Re claim 6: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches an ICP web page is provided with a registration information window (Gupta: ¶73); the ICP accesses the user-login-identification means via the interface module (page 6, lines 19-22) and verifies the login identification information provided by the ICP web page (Ferchichi: Fig 3, elts 302, 304 & 316; ¶79 and ¶81), and stores new login identification information in the user-login-identification means to overwrite original login identification information (Ferchichi: page 45, claim 39 teaches replacing a secret on the smart-card), and transfers relating information to the ICP web page (Gupta: ¶77); the information is displayed on the web page after being obtained (Gupta: ¶77).

Re claim 7: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the ICP web page is provided with a plurality of window links of the registration information (Gupta: ¶73); the ICP reads the user-login-identification information stored in the user-login-identification means and verifies the login identification information provided by the ICP web page; if positive, the login identification information is directly read out and the relating information is transferred to the ICP web page (Gupta: ¶73, ¶77); the information is displayed on the web page after being obtained (Gupta: ¶77). if verification appears negative, the login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means (Ferchichi and Gupta teach that if credentials provided by a combination of the user or the smart-card are invalid, access is denied; ergo, the user-login-identification means is unaltered.)

Re claim 8: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki further teaches a login verification serving party for implementing prior authentication to the ICP and

obtaining guide information of the user-login-identification means (Gupta: Fig 3, elt 304; prior to authorizing the client session, see steps 310 and 316 of Fig 3, elt 304, a prior authentication method, is preformed).

Re claim 9: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki further teaches the ICP is connected with a login verification serving party [Gupta: Fig 2, elt 204] which transmits a code for accessing the user-login-identification means to the ICP, and the ICP adds the login identification information in the login web page according to the code, and the interface module transmits the ICP information to the login verification serving party for verification; if the ICP information passed the verification, the ICP is permitted to access the user-login-identification means, wherein the user activates the user-login-identification means by using a password, and then the ICP accesses the login verification serving party for an authentication via the interface module; if the authentication is valid, the ICP can operate the user-login-identification means via the interface module and the actuating password used by the user is provided by the login verification serving party or preset in the means (Ferchichi: page 6, lines 11-26 and Gupta: ¶73, ¶77); the encryption files of the ICPs transmitted by the login verification serving party are different from each other (Ferchichi: page 8, lines 20-24 and Gupta: ¶86).

Re claim 10: Claim 10 is rejected under similar grounds as those provided in claim 1 *a priori*.

Re claim 11: Claim 11 is rejected under similar grounds as those stated in claim 9. Claim 11 is encompassed by claim 9.

Re claim 12: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches information transmission between the computer and the user-login-identification means is processed with encryption or decryption (Ferchichi: Table on pages 14-15); the encryption includes protecting an encryption area by using the user's PIN code or utilizing RSA 512PKI key management encryption method (Ferchichi: Table on pages 14-15).

Re claim 13: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the user-login-identification means is also provided with a storage region for storing the information of the ICP itself (Ferchichi: page 3, lines 1-2).

Re claim 14: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the user-login-identification means is an external and portable memory means with a standard data interface, or a card-reader means or an ID identifying means thereof (Ferchichi: (page 8, lines 8-11; page 11, lines 23-26; page 22, lines 19-21).

Re claim 15: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the user-login-identification means is a USB storage device, a CF card, a MMC card, a SD card, a SMC card, an IBM Micro Drive card, a flash storage module or an IC card (Ferchichi: Abstract; page 1, lines 1-2).

Re claim 16: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the portable memory card-reader means is a CF card processor, a MMC card processor, a SD card processor, a SMC card processor, an IBM Micro Drive card processor or an IC card processor (Ferchichi: page 19, lines 6-14; page 33, lines 9-12).

Re claim 17: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the user-login-identification means is a computer peripheral (Ferchichi: Abstract: lines 1-3; page 19, lines 6-14).

Re claim 18: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches the user-login-identification means is a portable PDA, a music player or an electrical dictionary (Ferchichi: Abstract: lines 1-3; page 19, lines 6-14).

2. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. (WO 01/60013 A1), hereinafter referred to as Ferchichi, Gupta et al. (U.S. Pat Pub 2001/0037469 A1), hereinafter referred to as Gupta, and Kawasaki (U.S. Pat Pub 7010688 B1), hereinafter referred to as Kawasaki, in further view of Wu, Wei-Je (TW 480435), hereinafter referred to as Wu.

Re claim 2: The combination of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as previously discussed and further teach the administration/drive module is used to automatically log in, in the case that the ICP accesses the user-login-identification means via the interface module and verifies the identification information.

However, Wu teaches the administration/drive module is used to lead in and/or lead out data stored in the user-login-identification means so as to backup the data (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki

with the teachings of Wu for the purpose of securing content stored on an original smart in the event that it is lost, damaged or becomes inaccessible to the user.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the text of the passage taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARREN SCHWARTZ whose telephone number is (571)270-3850. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571)272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2435
/Kimyen Vu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435